

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-18 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Claims 1 and 4-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lau (Programming by Demonstration: a Machine Learning Approach (2001)). The Examiner stated essentially that Lau teaches all the limitations of Claims 1 and 4-18.

Claims 1 and 18 claim, *inter alia*, "performing an alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps, wherein the alignment of the plurality of steps identifies a set of steps in the plurality of steps that are equivalent once generalized, and wherein the generalization of the plurality of steps predicts differences between individual steps belonging to the identified set of steps in the plurality of steps and determines that the identified set of steps perform a distinct action in the procedure."

Lau teaches a method for editing text including translation, learning and recognition phases (see pages 33-34). Lau's SMARTedit tool takes training examples including an initial demonstration and one or more examples of feedback and learns functions that map from one state to the next (see pages 41-42). The functions are programs in a version space. Lau teaches that the version space is updated to contain only programs that are consistent with the demonstration the user has performed (see page 39). Lau fails to anticipate aligning "a set of steps in the plurality of steps that are equivalent once generalized" or "that the identified set of steps perform a distinct action in the procedure" (see page 11, lines 9-19 of the specification). Lau considers each step individually, mapping it to a program in the version space. Lau fails to map a set of steps together against the version space; Lau fails to perform a generalization

identifying a set of steps from among a plurality of steps for performing a distinct action as claimed. Therefore, Lau fails to teach all of the claimed limitations of Claims 1 and 18.

Claims 4-12, 15-17 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including Claims 1 and 4-18, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 18, 2008

By: /Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889